arXiv:1408.3349v1 [math.RT] 14 Aug 2014

Acyclic coefficient systems on buildings

Elmar Grosse-Klönne

Abstract

For cohomological (resp. homological) coefficient systems $\mathcal{F}$ (resp. $\mathcal{V}$) on affine buildings X with Coxeter data of type $\widetilde{A}_d$ we give for any $k \geq 1$ a sufficient local criterion which implies $H^k(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ (resp. $H_k(X, \mathcal{V}) = 0$). Using this criterion we prove a conjecture of de Shalit on the acyclicity of coefficient systems attached to hyperplane arrangements on the Bruhat-Tits building of the general linear group over a local field. We also generalize an acyclicity theorem of Schneider and Stuhler on coefficient systems attached to representations.

Introduction

Let X be an affine building whose apartments are Coxeter complexes attached to Coxeter systems of type $\widetilde{A}_d$ and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a cohomological coefficient system (ccs) on X. The purpose of this paper is to give a *local* criterion which assures that for a given $k \geq 1$ the cohomology group $H^k(X, \mathcal{F})$ vanishes. Similarly for homological coefficient systems.

For a sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ on a topological space Y it is well known that $H^k(Y, \mathcal{G}) = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$ if $\mathcal{G}$ is *flasque*, i.e. if all restriction maps $\mathcal{G}(U) \to \mathcal{G}(V)$ for open $V \subset U \subset Y$ are surjective. We are looking for an adequate notion of "flasque" ccs on X.

If $d = 1$ the same condition works: If the restriction map $\mathcal{F}(\sigma) \to \mathcal{F}(\tau)$ for any 0-simplex σ contained in the 1-simplex τ is surjective, then $H^1(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$. This is easily seen using the *contractibility* of X. However, if $d > 1$ the surjectivity of $\mathcal{F}(\sigma) \to \mathcal{F}(\tau)$ for any $(k-1)$-simplex σ contained in the k-simplex τ does not guarantee $H^k(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$. The other naive transposition of the flasqueness concept from topological spaces to buildings would be to require for any $(k-1)$-simplex σ the surjectivity of $\mathcal{F}(\sigma) \to \prod_\tau \mathcal{F}(\tau)$, taking the product over *all* k-simplices τ containing σ. This would indeed force $H^k(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ but would also be a completely useless criterion: for example, it would not be satisfied by a constant ccs $\mathcal{F}$ (of which we know $H^k(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$, by the contractibility of X).

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20E42

Key words and phrases. building, Bruhat-Tits building, coefficient system, cohomology, hyperplane arrangement, Orlik-Solomon algebra

I am very grateful to Peter Schneider whose comments helped me a lot to eliminate inacurracies and to streamline presentation, terminology and notations. I thank Ehud de Shalit and Annette Werner for related discussions. Thanks also go to the referee for his careful reading and for supplying a simple proof for Lemma 2.3.

Let us describe our criterion $\mathcal{S}(k)$. We fix an orientation of X. It defines a *cyclic* ordering on the set of vertices of any simplex, hence a true ordering on the set of vertices of any *pointed* simplex. To a pointed $(k-1)$-simplex $\widehat{\eta}$ we associate the set $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ of all vertices z for which $(z, \widehat{\eta})$ (i.e. z as the first vertex) is an ordered k-simplex (in the previously qualified sense). We define what it means for a subset M_0 of $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ to be *stable with respect to* $\widehat{\eta}$ (if for example $d = 1$ the condition is $|M_0| \leq 1$). Our criterion $\mathcal{S}(k)$ which assures $H^k(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ is then that for any such $\widehat{\eta}$ and for any subset M_0 of $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$, stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$, the sequence

$$\mathcal{F}(\eta) \longrightarrow \prod_{z \in M_0} \mathcal{F}(\{z\} \cup \eta) \longrightarrow \prod_{z, z' \in M_0} \mathcal{F}(\{z, z'\} \cup \eta)$$

is exact (where in the target of the second arrow the product is over pairs $z, z' \in M_0$ of incident vertices). For example, a constant ccs $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies $\mathcal{S}(k)$.

Having fixed a vertex z_0, the central ingredient in the proof is then a certain function i on the set X^0 of vertices which measures the combinatorical (not: Euclidean) distance from z_0; it depends on our chosen orientation.

Dual to $\mathcal{S}(k)$ we describe a criterion $\mathcal{S}^*(k)$ which guarantees $H_k(X, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ for homological coefficient systems (hcs) $\mathcal{V}$ on X.

The basic example is of course the case where X is the Bruhat-Tits building of $\mathrm{PGL}_{d+1}(K)$ for a local field K. Our original motivation for developing the criterion $\mathcal{S}(k)$ was the following. In [9], Schneider defined a certain class of $\mathrm{SL}_{d+1}(K)$-representations, the "holomorphic discrete series representations", as the global sections of certain equivariant vector bundles on Drinfel'd's symmetric space $\Omega_K^{(d+1)}$ of dimension d over K. In a subsequent paper [6] we will construct for any such vector bundle V an integral model $\mathcal{V}$, as an equivariant coherent sheaf on the formal $\mathcal{O}_K$-scheme $\Omega_{\mathcal{O}_K}^{(d+1)}$ underlying $\Omega_K^{(d+1)}$. Using the criterion $\mathcal{S}(k)$ and the close relation between $\Omega_K^{(d+1)}$ and X, we will show that if V is strongly dominant (in a suitable sense), then $H^k(\Omega_{\mathcal{O}_K}^{(d+1)}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$. Examples for such $\mathcal{V}$ are the terms of the logarithmic de Rham complex of $\Omega_{\mathcal{O}_K}^{(d+1)}$.

Here we present two other applications. The first one is a proof of a conjecture of de Shalit on p-adic ccs of Orlik-Solomon algebras. For an arbitrary field K, the assignment of the Orlik-Solomon algebra A to a hyperplane arrangement W in $(K^{d+1})^*$ — the complement of a *finite* set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$ of hyperplanes in $(K^{d+1})^*$ — is a classical theme. A is defined combinatorically in terms of the hyperplanes and turns out to be isomorphic with the cohomology ring of W. Of course K may also be a local field. However, de Shalit [3] discovered that one can go further and give the story a *genuinely p-adic* flavour. Namely, if K is a local field he allows $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$ to be *infinite*. He assigns to $\mathcal{A}$ not a single Orlik-Solomon algebra but a ccs $A = A(.)$ of Orlik-Solomon algebras on the Bruhat-Tits building X of $\mathrm{PGL}_{d+1}(K)$ which then should play the role of a cohomology ring of the "hyperplane arrangement" defined by $\mathcal{A}$. The algebra $A(\sigma)$ for a j-simplex σ is closely related to a suitable tensor product of Orlik-Solomon algebras for finite hyperplane arrangements in k-vector spaces, for k the residue field of K. de Shalit conjectures that these beautiful ccs are acyclic in positive degrees, $H^k(X, A) = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$. He proved the conjecture for any $\mathcal{A}$ if $d \leq 2$. For arbitrary d he proved it if $\mathcal{A}$ is the full set $\mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$ of all

K-rational hyperplanes, and Alon [1] proved it if $\mathcal{A}$ is finite. Here we give a proof for all $\mathcal{A}$ and d by showing that A always satisfies $\mathcal{S}(k)$.

In fact we prove a version with arbitrary coefficient ring: While in [3] the coefficient ring of the ccs A is K, we allow an arbitrary coefficient ring R, e.g. also $R = \mathbb{Z}$ or $R = k$. While de Shalit's proof in case $d \leq 2$ also works for arbitrary R, his proof in case $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$ but d arbitrary, which is by reduction to the main result of [10], does not work for coefficient rings R other than characteristic zero fields. We explain why this improvement for $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$ and $R = \mathbb{Z}$ should have an application to a problem on p-adic Abel-Jacobi mappings raised in [8].

The second application we describe is concerned with the technique of Schneider and Stuhler to spread out representations of $\mathrm{GL_{d+1}}(K)$ as hcs on the Bruhat-Tits building of $\mathrm{PGL_{d+1}}(K)$. For a $\mathrm{GL_{d+1}}(K)$-representation on a (not necessarily free) $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$-module V (where $p = \mathrm{char}(k)$) which is generated by its vectors fixed under a principal congruence subgroup $U^{(n)}$ of some level $n > 1$, we prove that the chain complex of the corresponding hcs is a resolution of V. For fields of characteristic zero as coefficient ring (instead of $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$) this is the main result of [10] — where however $n = 1$ is allowed. While the proof in [10] uses the Bernstein-Borel-Matsumoto theory, we do not need any representation theoretic input whatsoever.

1 The criterion

Let $d \geq 1$ and let X be an affine building whose apartments are Coxeter complexes attached to Coxeter systems of type $\widetilde{A}_d$. We refer to the book [2] for the basic definitions and properties of buildings. For $0 \leq j \leq d$ we denote by X^j the set of j-simplices. We generally identify a j-simplex with its set of vertices.

We fix an orientation of X. It distinguishes for any simplex a *cyclic* ordering on its set of vertices. A *pointed k-simplex* is an *enumeration* of the set of vertices of a k-simplex in its distinguished cyclic ordering; we write it as an ordered $(k+1)$-tuple of vertices.

For an apartment A in X we will slightly abuse notation by not distinguishing between A and its geometric realization $|A|$. There is (see [2] p.148) an isomorphism of A with $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbb{R}.(1,\ldots,1)$ — we view it here as an identification — such that, if $\{e_0,\ldots,e_d\}$ denotes the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ the following holds:

- the set of vertices in A is $\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}/\mathbb{Z}.(1,\ldots,1)$
- a $k+1$-tuple $(x_0,\ldots,x_k)$ of vertices in A is a pointed k-simplex if and only if there is a sequence
$$\emptyset \neq J_0 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq J_{k-1} \subsetneq \{0,\ldots,d\}$$
such that $\sum_{j\in J_t} e_j$ represents $x_t - x_k$ (formed with respect to the obvious group structure on $\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}/\mathbb{Z}.(1,\ldots,1)$), for any $0 \leq t \leq k-1$.

If $(x_0,\ldots,x_k)$ is a pointed k-simplex, we define $\ell((x_0,\ldots,x_k))$ to be the maximal number r such that there exists a pointed r-simplex $(y_0,\ldots,y_r)$ with $x_0 = y_0$ and $x_k = y_r$. For a pointed

$(k-1)$-simplex $\widehat{\eta} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ we define the set

$$N_{\widehat{\eta}} = \{z \in X^0 |\ (z, x_1, \ldots, x_k) \text{ is a pointed } k\text{-simplex}\}.$$

For $z \in N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ we write $(z, \widehat{\eta})$ for the pointed k-simplex $(z, x_1, \ldots, x_k)$. We define a partial ordering $\leq$ on $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ by

$$u_1 \leq u_2 \Longleftrightarrow [u_1 = u_2 \text{ or } (u_1, u_2, \widehat{\eta}) \text{ is a pointed } (k+1)\text{-simplex}].$$

Lemma 1.1. *For any $u_1, u_2 \in N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ the set*

$$W^{\widehat{\eta}}_{u_1,u_2} = \{u \in N_{\widehat{\eta}} |\ u \leq u_1 \text{ and } u \leq u_2\}$$

is empty or it contains an element u such that $\ell((u, \widehat{\eta})) < \ell((w, \widehat{\eta}))$ for all $w \in W^{\widehat{\eta}}_{u_1,u_2} - \{u\}$.

PROOF: Suppose we have two such candidates u, u'. We can find an apartment A which contains η, u_1, u_2, u and u' (for example because $\eta \cup \{u_1, u\}$ and $\{u', u_2\}$ are simplices). We identify A with $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbb{R}.(1, \ldots, 1)$ as above. There exist subsets $\emptyset \neq J_t \subsetneq \{0, \ldots, d\}$ for $1 \leq t \leq k-1$ and $\emptyset \neq I_s \subsetneq \{0, \ldots, d\}$ for $s = 1, 2$ such that $x_t - x_k$ is represented by $\sum_{j \in J_t} e_j$ and $u_s - x_k$ is represented by $\sum_{j \in I_s} e_j$. We have $I_s \subsetneq J_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq J_{k-1}$ for $s = 1, 2$. Hence both $u - x_k$ and $u' - x_k$ are represented by $\sum_{j \in I_1 \cap I_2} e_j$.

If $W^{\widehat{\eta}}_{u_1,u_2} \neq \emptyset$ we denote the element $u \in W^{\widehat{\eta}}_{u_1,u_2}$ from 1.1 by $[\eta | u_1, u_2]$. If $W^{\widehat{\eta}}_{u_1,u_2} = \emptyset$ then $[\eta | u_1, u_2]$ is undefined. A subset M_0 of $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ is called *stable with respect to* $\widehat{\eta}$ if for any two vertices $u_1, u_2 \in M_0$ the vertex $[\widehat{\eta} | u_1, u_2]$ is defined and belongs to M_0. (See 2.2 below for what this means on Bruhat-Tits buildings. When working out the applications described later, we became fully convinced that stability is a very natural condition.) Note that M_0 is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ if and only if it is stable with respect to the pointed 0-simplex x_k — this is because of $[x_k | u_1, u_2] = [\eta | u_1, u_2]$, as we saw in the proof of 1.1.

A *cohomological coefficient system* (ccs) $\mathcal{F}$ on X is the assignment of an abelian group $\mathcal{F}(\tau)$ to every simplex τ of X, and a homomorphism $r^\tau_\sigma : \mathcal{F}(\tau) \to \mathcal{F}(\sigma)$ to every face inclusion $\tau \subset \sigma$, such that $r^\sigma_\rho \circ r^\tau_\sigma = r^\tau_\rho$ whenever $\tau \subset \sigma \subset \rho$, and r^τ_τ is the identity.

Given a ccs $\mathcal{F}$, define the group $C^k(X, \mathcal{F})$ of k-cochains $(0 \leq k \leq d)$ to consist of the maps c, assigning to each k-simplex τ an element $c_\tau \in \mathcal{F}(\tau)$. Define

$$\partial = \partial^{k+1} : C^k(X, \mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow C^{k+1}(X, \mathcal{F})$$

by the rule

$$(\partial c)_\tau = \sum_{\tau' \subset \tau} [\tau : \tau'] r^{\tau'}_\tau (c_{\tau'})$$

where $[\tau : \tau'] = \pm 1$ is the incidence number (with respect to a fixed labelling of X as in [2] p. 30). Then $(C^\bullet(X, \mathcal{F}), \partial)$ is a complex ($\partial^2 = 0$), and its cohomology groups are denoted

$H^k(X,\mathcal{F})$.

Consider for $1 \leq k \leq d$ the following condition $\mathcal{S}(k)$ for a ccs $\mathcal{F}$ on X: For any pointed $(k-1)$-simplex $\widehat{\eta}$ with underlying $(k-1)$-simplex η and for any subset M_0 of $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ which is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$, the following subquotient complex of $C^\bullet(X,\mathcal{F})$ is exact:

$$\mathcal{F}(\eta) \xrightarrow{\partial^k} \prod_{z \in M_0} \mathcal{F}(\{z\} \cup \eta) \xrightarrow{\partial^{k+1}} \prod_{\substack{z,z' \in M_0 \\ \{z,z'\} \in X^1}} \mathcal{F}(\{z,z'\} \cup \eta)$$

(We regard the first term as a subgroup of $C^{k-1}(X,\mathcal{F})$, the second one as a direct summand of $C^k(X,\mathcal{F})$, and the third one as a quotient of $C^{k+1}(X,\mathcal{F})$.) Note that $\mathcal{S}(k)$ depends on the chosen orientation of X.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a ccs on X. Let $1 \leq k \leq d$ and suppose $\mathcal{S}(k)$ holds true. Then $H^k(X,\mathcal{F}) = 0$.*

We fix once and for all a vertex $z_0 \in X^0$. Given an arbitrary vertex $x \in X^0$, choose an apartment A containing z_0 and x. Choose an identification of A with $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbb{R}.(1,\ldots,1)$ as before, but now require in addition that $z_0 \in A$ corresponds to the class of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbb{R}.(1,\ldots,1)$. Let $\sum_{j=0}^d m_j e_j$ be the unique representative of x for which $m_j \geq 0$ for all j, and $m_j = 0$ for at least one j. Let π be a permutation of $\{0,\ldots,d\}$ such that $m_{\pi(d)} \geq \ldots \geq m_{\pi(0)} \geq 0$ and set

$$i(x) = (m_{\pi(d)},\ldots,m_{\pi(1)}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d.$$

Lemma 1.3. *The d-tuple $i(x)$ is independent of the choice of A.*

Proof: Let us write $i_A(x)$ instead of $i(x)$ in order to indicate the reference to A in the above definition. Suppose the apartment A' also contains z_0 and x. Choose a chamber (d-simplex) C in A containing x, and a chamber C' in A' containing z_0. Choose an apartment A'' in X containing C and C', and let $\pi : X \to A''$, resp. $\pi' : X \to A''$, be the retraction from X to A'' centered in C, resp. centered in C' (see [2] p.86). Then π, resp. π', induces an isomorphism of oriented chamber complexes $A \cong A''$, resp. $A' \cong A''$. Hence $i_A(x) = i_{A''}(x) = i_{A'}(x)$.

Here is another, equivalent but more intrinsic definition of $i(x)$ (we do not need it). For $x,y \in X^0$ let $d(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be the minimal number t such that there exists a sequence $x_0,\ldots,x_t$ in X^0 with $x = x_0$, $y = x_t$ and $\{x_{r-1},x_r\} \in X^1$ for all $1 \leq r \leq t$. For $x \in X^0$ and a subset $W \subset X^0$ let $d(x,W) = \min\{d(x,y) | \, y \in W\}$. For $1 \leq i \leq d$ define the subset W_i of X^0 inductively as follows: $W_1 = \{z_0\}$ and

$$W_i = \{z \in X^0 | \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{there exist elements } u_0,\ldots,u_r \in X^0 \text{ such that } r = d(z,W_{i-1}), \\ u_0 \in W_{i-1}, u_r = z \text{ and } \ell((u_{\ell-1},u_\ell)) = 1 \text{ for all } 1 \leq \ell \leq r \end{array} \right\}.$$

In particular $W_1 \subset W_2 \subset \ldots \subset W_d$. For $x \in X^0$ we then have

$$i(x) = (d(x,W_1), d(x,W_2),\ldots,d(x,W_d)).$$

Yet another equivalent definition of $i(x)$ (which we do not need either) results from the fact that the type of a minimal chamber-gallery connecting x and z_0 encodes $i(x)$ if x and z_0 are *not* incident.

On the set of ordered d-tuples $(n_1, \ldots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$ (and hence on the set of d-tuples $i(x)$ for $x \in X^0$) we use the lexicographical ordering:

$$(n_1, \ldots, n_d) < (n'_1, \ldots, n'_d) \Longleftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{there is a } 1 \leq r \leq d \text{ such that} \\ n_j = n'_j \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq r-1 \text{ and } n_r < n'_r \end{array} \right\}$$

Lemma 1.4. *Let η be a $(k-1)$-simplex and let $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ be an enumeration of its vertices which satisfies $i(x_1) \leq \ldots \leq i(x_k)$. Then in fact $i(x_1) < \ldots < i(x_k)$ and $\widehat{\eta} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ is a pointed $(k-1)$-simplex.*

PROOF: Choose an apartment A containing z_0 and η, and choose an identification of A with $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbb{R}.(1, \ldots, 1)$ as before, with $z_0 \in A$ corresponding to the class of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbb{R}.(1, \ldots, 1)$. Then the claims follow easily from our description of the simplicial structure of $\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}/\mathbb{Z}.(1, \ldots, 1)$.

Lemma 1.5. *For any $x \in X^0$, $x \neq z_0$, there is among the vertices incident to x a unique vertex $\nu(x)$ with minimal i-value: for all other vertices z incident to x we have $i(\nu(x)) < i(z)$. If z is incident to x, different from $\nu(x)$ and satisfies $i(z) < i(x)$, then $\nu(x)$ and z are incident and $\ell((\nu(x), z)) \leq \ell((x, z))$.*

PROOF: Let $[z_0, x]$ be the geodesic (with respect to the Euclidean distance function on the geometric realization $|X|$ of X) between z_0 and x. Let τ be the minimal simplex which contains x and whose open interior (viewed as a subset of $|X|$) contains a point of $[z_0, x]$. We assert that the vertex $\nu(x)$ of τ with minimal i-value is as claimed. To see this, let A be an arbitrary apartment containing x and z_0. Then τ is contained in A because this is true for $[z_0, x]$. Explicitly it can be described as follows. Choose an identification of A with $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbb{R}.(1, \ldots, 1)$ as before, with $z_0 \in A$ corresponding to the class of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbb{R}.(1, \ldots, 1)$. After reindexing the basis if necessary there are sequences $0 \leq r_0 < r_1 < \ldots < r_s = d$ and $0 < m_1 < \ldots < m_s$ (some $1 \leq s \leq d$) such that the vertex x is represented by $y_s = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \sum_{j=r_{i-1}+1}^{r_i} m_i e_j$. Then $\{hy_s |\ 0 \leq h \leq 1\}$ represents $[z_0, x]$, and τ is a s-simplex, the other vertices are represented by $y_t = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \sum_{j=r_{i-1}+1}^{r_i} m_i e_j + \sum_{i=t+1}^{s} \sum_{j=r_{i-1}+1}^{r_i} (m_i - 1) e_j$ for $t = 0, \ldots, s-1$. In particular $\nu(x)$ is represented by y_0 and it is clear that it has minimal i-value among the vertices of A incident to x. Since any vertex in X incident to x lies in such an A the assertion follows. Also the other claims can immediately be read off from this analysis on an apartment.

Proposition 1.6. *Let $\widehat{\eta} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ be as in 1.4 and let $\eta = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$. Then*

$$M_0 = \{u \in X^0 |\ \{u\} \cup \eta \text{ is a } k\text{-simplex and } i(u) < i(x_1)\}$$

is contained in $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ and stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$.

PROOF: The containment $M_0 \subset N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ follows from 1.4 with k instead of $(k-1)$. To prove that M_0 is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$ let $u_1, u_2 \in M_0$. First it follows from 1.4 (with k and $k+1$ instead of $(k-1)$) and 1.5 that $\nu(x_k) \in W^{\widehat{\eta}}_{u_1,u_2}$, hence $[\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]$ is defined. Since $([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2],x_1,\ldots,x_k)$ is a pointed k-simplex and since for any pointed k-simplex the underlying *cyclic* ordering of the vertices is independent of the pointing, there are — in view of 1.4 with k instead of $(k-1)$ — only the two possibilities $i([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]) < i(x_1)$ and $i([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]) > i(x_k)$. If $i([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]) < i(x_1)$ then $[\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2] \in M_0$ and we are done. If $i([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]) > i(x_k)$ then $\nu([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]) \in W^{\widehat{\eta}}_{u_1,u_2}$ by 1.4 and 1.5. Moreover

$$\ell((\nu([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]),\widehat{\eta})) \leq \ell(([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2],\widehat{\eta}))$$

also by 1.5. Since $\nu([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]) \neq [\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]$ this contradicts the definition of $[\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]$. Hence $i([\widehat{\eta}|u_1,u_2]) > i(x_k)$ can not happen and the proof is finished.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2: Given $\eta,\eta' \in X^{k-1}$ let $x_1,\ldots,x_k$, resp. $x'_1,\ldots,x'_k$, be that enumeration of the vertices of η, resp. of η', which satisfies $i(x_1) < \ldots < i(x_k)$, resp. $i(x'_1) < \ldots < i(x'_k)$. We define

$$\eta \widetilde{<} \eta' \Longleftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{there is a } 1 \leq q \leq k \text{ such that} \\ i(x_t) = i(x'_t) \text{ for } 1 \leq t \leq q-1 \text{ and } i(x_q) < i(x'_q) \end{array} \right\}.$$

We define $\eta \widetilde{=} \eta'$ if $i(x_t) = i(x'_t)$ for all $1 \leq t \leq k$. Let $\nabla : X^{k-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the surjective map with

$$\nabla(\eta) < \nabla(\eta') \Longleftrightarrow \eta \widetilde{<} \eta'$$

$$\nabla(\eta) = \nabla(\eta') \Longleftrightarrow \eta \widetilde{=} \eta'.$$

For a k-simplex $\sigma \in X^k$ let $\sigma^- \in X^{k-1}$ be the $(k-1)$-simplex obtained from σ by omitting the vertex $x \in \sigma$ for which $i(x)$ is minimal. We need to show that

$$\prod_{\eta \in X^{k-1}} \mathcal{F}(\eta) \stackrel{\partial^k}{\longrightarrow} \prod_{\sigma \in X^k} \mathcal{F}(\sigma) \stackrel{\partial^{k+1}}{\longrightarrow} \prod_{\tau \in X^{k+1}} \mathcal{F}(\tau)$$

is exact. So let a k-cocycle $c = (c_\sigma)_{\sigma \in X^k} \in \mathrm{Ker}(\partial^{k+1})$ be given. It suffices to show that there is a sequence of $(k-1)$-cochains $(b_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} = ((b_{n,\eta})_{\eta \in X^{k-1}})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $b_{n,\eta} \in \mathcal{F}(\eta)$ satisfying the following properties:

(i) $b_{n,\eta} = b_{\nabla(\eta),\eta}$ for all $n \geq \nabla(\eta)$.

(ii) $b_{n,\eta} = 0$ for all $\eta \in X^{k-1}$ with $\nabla(\eta) > n$.

(iii) For all $\sigma \in X^k$ with $\nabla(\sigma^-) \leq n$ we have $(\partial^k b_n - c)_\sigma = 0$.

Then the cochain $b_\infty = (b_{\infty,\eta})_{\eta \in X^{k-1}}$ defined by $b_{\infty,\eta} = b_{\nabla(\eta),\eta}$ will be a preimage of c, as follows from (i) and (iii).

We construct $(b_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ inductively. Suppose b_{n-1} has been constructed. We set $b_{n,\eta} = b_{n-1,\eta}$ for all $\eta \in X^{k-1}$ with $\nabla(\eta) < n$, and $b_{n,\eta} = 0$ for all $\eta \in X^{k-1}$ with $\nabla(\eta) > n$. Now suppose we

have $\eta \in X^{k-1}$ with $\nabla(\eta) = n$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ be that enumeration of the vertices of η which satisfies $i(x_1) < \ldots < i(x_k)$. Consider the set

$$M_0 = \{z \in X^0 |\ \{z\} \cup \eta \text{ is a } k\text{-simplex and } i(z) < i(x_1)\}. \tag{1}$$

We know from 1.4 and 1.6 that $\widehat{\eta} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ is a pointed $(k-1)$-simplex and that M_0 is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$ and contained in $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$. If $M_0 = \emptyset$ we put $b_{n,\eta} = 0$. So assume now that $M_0 \neq \emptyset$. Let z, $z' \in M_0$ with $\{z, z'\} \in X^1$. We compute (with $\pm$, resp. r, denoting the respective incidence numbers, resp. restriction maps):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial^{k+1}(((\partial^k b_{n-1} - c)_{z''\cup\eta})_{z''\in M_0})_{\{z,z'\}\cup\eta\}} \\
=&\pm\ r((\partial^k b_{n-1} - c)_{z\cup\eta}) \pm r((\partial^k b_{n-1} - c)_{z'\cup\eta}) \\
=&\pm\ r((\partial^k b_{n-1} - c)_{z\cup\eta}) \pm r((\partial^k b_{n-1} - c)_{z'\cup\eta}) + \sum_{\{z,z'\}\subset\sigma\subset\{z,z'\}\cup\eta} \pm\, r((\partial^k b_{n-1} - c)_\sigma) \\
=&\sum_{\sigma\subset\{z,z'\}\cup\eta} \pm\, r((\partial^k b_{n-1} - c)_\sigma) \\
=&(\partial^{k+1}(\partial^k b_{n-1} - c))_{\{z,z'\}\cup\eta}
\end{aligned}$$

and this is zero because c is a cocycle. For the second equality note that for all $\sigma \in X^k$ with $\{z, z'\} \subset \sigma \subset \{z, z'\} \cup \eta$ we have $\nabla(\sigma^-) < n$ which by induction hypothesis implies $(\partial^k b_{n-1} - c)_\sigma = 0$. We have seen that $((\partial^k b_{n-1} - c)_{\{z\}\cup\eta})_{z\in M_0}$ lies in

$$\mathrm{Ker}[\prod_{z\in M_0} \mathcal{F}(\{z\}\cup\eta) \xrightarrow{\partial^{k+1}} \prod_{\substack{z,z'\in M_0 \\ \{z,z'\}\in X^1}} \mathcal{F}(\{z,z'\}\cup\eta)].$$

We can therefore define $b_{n,\eta} \in \mathcal{F}(\eta)$ as a preimage of $[\sigma : \sigma^-]((c - \partial^k b_{n-1})_{\{z\}\cup\eta})_{z\in M_0}$, by hypothesis $\mathcal{S}(k)$. To see that b_n satisfies (iii) for $\sigma \in X^k$ with $\nabla(\sigma^-) = n$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
(\partial b_n - c)_\sigma &= (\sum_{\eta\subset\sigma} [\sigma : \eta] r_\sigma^\eta(b_{n,\eta})) - c_\sigma \\
&= (\sum_{\substack{\eta\subset\sigma \\ \nabla(\eta)<n}} [\sigma : \eta] r_\sigma^\eta(b_{n,\eta})) + [\sigma : \sigma^-] r_\sigma^{\sigma^-}(b_{n,\sigma^-}) - c_\sigma \\
&= (\sum_{\substack{\eta\subset\sigma \\ \nabla(\eta)<n}} [\sigma : \eta] r_\sigma^\eta(b_{n-1,\eta})) + (c - \partial^k b_{n-1})_\sigma - c_\sigma \\
&= (\sum_{\substack{\eta\subset\sigma \\ \nabla(\eta)<n}} [\sigma : \eta] r_\sigma^\eta(b_{n-1,\eta})) - (\sum_{\eta\subset\sigma} [\sigma : \eta] r_\sigma^\eta(b_{n-1,\eta}))
\end{aligned}$$

and this is zero because we have $b_{n-1,\sigma^-} = 0$ by induction hypothesis (ii).

The reader will have observed that any $\mathbb{N}$-valued function i on X^0 which takes different values on incident vertices gives rise to a local vanishing criterion like $\mathcal{S}(k)$, by the same formal proof above. However, the applicability of the resulting criterion depends on the control one

gets over the corresponding sets M_0 defined analogously through formula (1). In this optic, the virtue of our particular choice of i lies in the fact that we can control the corresponding sets M_0: they satisfy the *local* (no reference to the global function i) property of being stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$; hence our vanishing criterion $\mathcal{S}(k)$, expressed entirely in local terms.

A *homological coefficient system* (hcs) $\mathcal{V}$ of abelian groups on a building X is the assignment of an abelian group $\mathcal{V}(\tau)$ to every simplex τ of X, and a homomorphism $r_\sigma^\tau : \mathcal{V}(\tau) \to \mathcal{V}(\sigma)$ to every face inclusion $\sigma \subset \tau$, such that $r_\rho^\tau \circ r_\tau^\sigma = r_\rho^\sigma$ whenever $\rho \subset \tau \subset \sigma$, and r_τ^τ is the identity.

The group $C_k(X, \mathcal{V})$ of k-chains ($0 \leq k \leq d$) consists of all the finitely supported maps c which assign to each k-simplex τ an element $c_\tau \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)$. Define

$$\partial = \partial_k : C_{k+1}(X, \mathcal{V}) \longrightarrow C_k(X, \mathcal{V})$$

by the rule

$$(\partial c)_\tau = \sum_{\tau' \supset \tau} [\tau' : \tau] r_\tau^{\tau'}(c_{\tau'}).$$

Then $(C_\bullet(X, \mathcal{V}), \partial)$ is a complex ($\partial^2 = 0$), and its homology groups are denoted $H_k(X, \mathcal{V})$.

Consider for $1 \leq k \leq d$ the following condition $\mathcal{S}^*(k)$ for a hcs $\mathcal{V}$ on X: For any pointed $(k-1)$-simplex $\widehat{\eta}$ with underlying $(k-1)$-simplex η and for any subset M_0 of $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ which is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$, the following subquotient complex of $(C_\bullet(X, \mathcal{V}), \partial)$ is exact:

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{z,z' \in M_0 \\ \{z,z'\} \in X^1}} \mathcal{V}(\{z, z'\} \cup \eta) \xrightarrow{\partial_k} \bigoplus_{z \in M_0} \mathcal{V}(\{z\} \cup \eta) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k-1}} \mathcal{V}(\eta).$$

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a hcs on X. Let $1 \leq k \leq d$ and suppose $\mathcal{S}^*(k)$ holds true. Then $H_k(X, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.*

Proof: We need to show that

$$\bigoplus_{\tau \in X^{k+1}} \mathcal{V}(\tau) \xrightarrow{\partial_k} \bigoplus_{\sigma \in X^k} \mathcal{V}(\sigma) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k-1}} \bigoplus_{\eta \in X^{k-1}} \mathcal{V}(\eta)$$

is exact. We use notations from the proof of 1.2. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and elements $c = (c_\sigma)_\sigma \in \oplus_{\sigma \in X^k} \mathcal{V}(\sigma)$ consider the condition

$$C(n): \text{ for all } \sigma \in X^k \text{ with } \nabla(\sigma^-) \geq n \text{ we have } c_\sigma = 0.$$

Similarly as in the proof of 1.2 one shows by induction on n: all elements $c \in \mathrm{Ker}(\partial_{k-1})$ which satisfy $C(n)$ ly in $\mathrm{im}(\partial_k)$. Indeed, given such an element c one uses $\mathcal{S}^*(k)$ in order to modify c by an element of $\mathrm{im}(\partial_k)$ in such a way that it even satisfies $C(n-1)$, and then the induction hypothesis applies.

2 p-adic hyperplane arrangements

Let K denote a non-archimedean locally compact field, $\mathcal{O}_K$ its ring of integers, $\pi \in \mathcal{O}_K$ a fixed prime element and k the residue field. Let X be the Bruhat-Tits building of PGL_{d+1}/K; it has Coxeter data of type $\widetilde{A}_d$. A concrete descriptions of X is the following. A lattice in the K-vector space K^{d+1} is a free $\mathcal{O}_K$-submodule of K^{d+1} of rank $d+1$. Two lattices L, L' are called homothetic if $L' = \lambda L$ for some $\lambda \in K^\times$. We denote the homothety class of L by $[L]$. The set of vertices of X is the set of the homothety classes of lattices (always: in K^{d+1}). For a lattice chain

$$\pi L_k \subsetneq L_0 \subsetneq L_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq L_k$$

we declare $([L_0], \ldots, [L_k])$ to be a pointed k-simplex. This defines a simplicial structure with orientation.

The following definitions are due to de Shalit [3] (who takes $R = K$, $\mathrm{char}(K) = 0$ below). Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a non empty subset of $\mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$. We view $\mathcal{A}$ as a set of lines in K^{d+1}, or hyperplanes in $(K^{d+1})^*$. We write e_a for the line represented by $a \in K^{d+1} - \{0\}$, so that $e_{\lambda a} = e_a$ for any $\lambda \in K^\times$.

Let R be a commutative ring and let $\widetilde{E}$ be the free exterior algebra over R, on the set $\mathcal{A}$. It is graded and anti-commutative. There is a unique derivation $\delta : \widetilde{E} \to \widetilde{E}$, homogeneous of degree -1, mapping each $e \in \mathcal{A}$ to 1. It satisfies $\delta^2 = 0$ and

$$\delta(e_0 \wedge \ldots \wedge e_k) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^i e_0 \wedge \ldots \wedge \widehat{e_i} \wedge \ldots \wedge e_k$$

$$\mathrm{im}(\delta) = \mathrm{Ker}(\delta).$$

The subalgebra $E = \mathrm{im}(\delta) = \mathrm{Ker}(\delta)$ of $\widetilde{E}$ is generated by all elements $e - e'$ for $e, e' \in \mathcal{A}$. There is an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow \widetilde{E} \xrightarrow{\delta} E[1] \longrightarrow 0 \tag{2}$$

and any $e \in \mathcal{A}$ supplies a splitting $E[1] \to \widetilde{E}$, $x \mapsto e \wedge x$.

Let $x \in X^0$ be a vertex. We say that an element $g \in \widetilde{E}$ is a *standard generator of* $I(x)$ if there are a lattice L_x representing x and elements $\{a_0, \ldots, a_m\}$ of $\mathcal{A} \cap L_x - \pi L_x$, linearly dependent modulo πL_x, such that $g = \delta(e_{a_0} \wedge \ldots \wedge e_{a_m})$. We define the ideal $I(x)$ in $\widetilde{E}$ as the one generated by the standard generators of $I(x)$. For an arbitrary simplex σ we define the ideal $I(\sigma) = \sum_{x \in \sigma} I(x)$. We set

$$\widetilde{A}(\sigma) = \frac{\widetilde{E}}{I(\sigma)}, \qquad A(\sigma) = \frac{E}{E \cap I(\sigma)}.$$

The split exact sequence (2) provides us with a split exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A(\sigma) \longrightarrow \widetilde{A}(\sigma) \xrightarrow{\delta} A(\sigma)[1] \longrightarrow 0. \tag{3}$$

The ideal $I(\sigma)$ is homogeneous, hence there is a natural grading on $\widetilde{A}(\sigma)$ and on $A(\sigma)$. We denote by $\widetilde{A}^q(\sigma)$ resp. by $A^q(\sigma)$ the q-th graded piece. For varying σ the $\widetilde{A}(\sigma)$ and $A(\sigma)$ form ccs $\widetilde{A}$ and A on X.

Suppose we are given a lattice chain

$$\pi L_k \subsetneq L_1 \subsetneq L_2 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq L_k.$$

Let $x_j \in X^0$ be the vertex defined by L_j; then $\widehat{\eta} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ is a pointed $(k-1)$-simplex; we denote by η the underlying non pointed $(k-1)$-simplex. We write $L_0 = \pi L_k$. As long as L_k is fixed we abuse notation in that we identify an element $e \in \mathcal{A}$ with an element $a \in L_k - L_0$ for which $e = e_a$; such an a is unique up to a unit in $\mathcal{O}_K$. Thus we regard $\mathcal{A}$ as a subset of $L_k - L_0$.

Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is finite and fix a linear ordering $\prec$ on $\mathcal{A}$ which is *adapted to* $\widehat{\eta}$. By definition, this means $\max(\mathcal{A} \cap L_j - L_{j-1}) \prec \min(\mathcal{A} \cap L_{j+1} - L_j)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k-1$. For $S \subset \mathcal{A}$ and $e \in S$ we define the $\mathcal{O}_K$-submodule $L(\widehat{\eta}, \prec, S, e)$ of K^{d+1} as follows: Let $1 \leq j \leq k$ be the number for which $e \in L_j - L_{j-1}$; then

$$L(\widehat{\eta}, \prec, S, e) =< L_{j-1},\ \{e' \in S |\ e' \prec e \text{ or } e' = e\} >_{\mathcal{O}_K} .$$

We say that e *is* $(S, \widehat{\eta})$*-special with respect to* $\prec$ if

$$e = \max_{\prec}(\mathcal{A} \cap L(\widehat{\eta}, \prec, S, e))$$

(Here $\max_{\prec}(Q)$ for a subset Q of $\mathcal{A}$ means the maximal element of Q with respect to the fixed ordering $\prec$. The subscript $\prec$ does *not* indicate that $\prec$ is a running parameter.)

Fix another linear ordering $<$ on $\mathcal{A}$ and for subsets S of $\mathcal{A}$ let $e_S = e_0 \wedge \ldots \wedge e_r \in \widehat{E}$ where $e_0 < e_1 < \ldots < e_r$ is the increasing enumeration of the elements of S in the ordering $<$. (The ordering $<$ may be taken to be $\prec$, but the role of these two orderings will be completely unrelated in the following).

Lemma 2.1. *$\widetilde{A}(\eta)$ is a free R-module of finite rank, a basis is the set*

$$\{e_S |\ S \subset \mathcal{A},\ \text{all } e \in S \text{ are } (S, \widehat{\eta})\text{-special with respect to } \prec\}.$$

Proof: This is [3] Theorem 2.5: the "broken circuit theorem" (there $R = K$, $\mathrm{char}(K) = 0$ and $\prec = <$, but this is irrelevant).

Let $N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ be as in section 1. A subset $M_0 \subset N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ corresponds to a collection of lattices $(L_z)_{z \in M_0}$ with $L_0 \subsetneq L_z \subsetneq L_1$ for all $z \in M_0$. The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 2.2. *M_0 is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$ if and only if for all $z_1, z_2 \in M_0$ the lattice $L_{z_1} \cap L_{z_2}$ represents an element of M_0.*

Suppose that $M_0 \subset N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$. In particular there is a $x_0 \in M_0$ with $L_{x_0} \subset L_z$ for all $z \in M_0$. We say that a collection $(\prec_z)_{z \in M_0}$, indexed by M_0, of linear orderings on $\mathcal{A}$ is *adapted to* $(M_0, \widehat{\eta})$ if the following conditions hold:

- For any $z \in M_0$ the ordering $\prec_z$ is adapted to the pointed k-simplex $(z, \widehat{\eta})$.
- For any $z_1, z_2 \in M_0$ with $L_{z_1} \subset L_{z_2}$ we have $[e \prec_{z_1} e' \Leftrightarrow e \prec_{z_2} e']$ for all pairs $e, e' \in \mathcal{A} \cap L_{z_1}$ and also for all pairs $e, e' \in \mathcal{A} \cap L_{z_2} - L_{z_1}$.
- For any $z \in M_0$ we have $[e \prec_{x_0} e' \Leftrightarrow e \prec_z e']$ for all pairs $e, e' \in \mathcal{A} \cap L_k - L_z$.
- We have $e \prec_{x_0} e'$ for all pairs $e, e' \in \mathcal{A}$ with $e \in \bigcup_{z \in M_0} L_z$ and $e' \notin \bigcup_{z \in M_0} L_z$.

Lemma 2.3. *Collections of linear orderings on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to $(M_0, \widehat{\eta})$ exist.*

PROOF: The referee suggested the following proof (our original one was unnecessarily complicated). Let $U = \bigcup_{z \in M_0} L_z$. Fix a linear ordering $\prec$ on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to $\widehat{\eta}$ which satisfies $e \prec e'$ for all pairs $e, e' \in \mathcal{A}$ with $e \in U$ and $e' \notin U$. For a $z \in M_0$ let $\prec_z$ be the ordering which satisfies firstly $e \prec_z e' \prec_z e''$ for all triples $e, e', e'' \in \mathcal{A}$ with $e \in L_z$, with $e' \in U - L_z$ and with $e'' \in L_k - U$, and secondly $[e \prec e' \Leftrightarrow e \prec_z e']$ for all pairs $e, e' \in \mathcal{A} \cap L_z$, for all pairs $e, e' \in \mathcal{A} \cap U - L_z$ and for all pairs $e, e' \in \mathcal{A} - (\mathcal{A} \cap U)$. It is straightforwardly checked that $(\prec_z)_{z \in M_0}$ is adapted to $(M_0, \widehat{\eta})$.

Fix a collection $(\prec_z)_{z \in M_0}$ of linear orderings on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to $(M_0, \widehat{\eta})$. Let

$$G(\widehat{\eta}; M_0) = \{\ e_S \mid \begin{array}{c} S \subset \mathcal{A},\ \text{for all } e \in S \text{ there is a} \\ z \in M_0 \text{ such that } e \text{ is } (S, (z, \widehat{\eta}))\text{-special} \end{array} \}$$

where $(S, (z, \widehat{\eta}))$-speciality is to be understood with respect to $\prec_z$. Let $J(\widehat{\eta}; M_0) \subset \widetilde{E}$ be the ideal generated by the set

$$I(\eta) \bigcup \{g \in \widetilde{E} |\ g \text{ is a standard generator of } I(z) \text{ for all } z \in M_0\}.$$

Proposition 2.4. *$G(\widehat{\eta}; M_0)$ is finite and generates $\widetilde{E}/J(\widehat{\eta}; M_0)$ as an R-module.*

PROOF: Clearly the set of *all* e_S with $S \subset \mathcal{A}$ is generating. Now suppose that $S \subset \mathcal{A}$ does not satisfy the condition defining $G(\widehat{\eta}; M_0)$. That is, there exists an $e \in S$ such that for all $z \in M_0$ this e is *not* $(S, (z, \widehat{\eta}))$-special. Fix such an e.

We first claim that there is an $\widehat{e} \in S$ and a subset $\widehat{S} \subset S$ such that for all $z \in M_0$ the following statements (1) and (2) are satisfied:

(1) For all $e' \in \widehat{S}$ we have $e' \prec_z e \prec_z \widehat{e}$.

(2) The element $\delta(e_{\widehat{S} \cup \{e, \widehat{e}\}})$ belongs to $J(\widehat{\eta}; M_0)$.

We distinguish three cases. First consider the case $e \in L_j - L_{j-1}$ for some $2 \leq j \leq k$. Then we set $\widehat{S} = \{e' \in S |\ e' \prec_{x_0} e \text{ and } e' \notin L_{j-1}\}$ and

$$\widehat{e} = \max_{\prec_{x_0}} (\mathcal{A} \cap L((x_0, \widehat{\eta}), \prec_{x_0}, S, e)).$$

The fact that e is not $(S,(x_0,\widehat{\eta}))$-special and the properties of the adapted collection $(\prec_z)_{z\in M_0}$ give statement (1). Moreover $\widehat{S}\cup\{e,\widehat{e}\}$ is linearly dependent modulo L_{j-1}, hence $\delta(e_{\widehat{S}\cup\{e,\widehat{e}\}})$ lies in $I(x_{j-1})\subset I(\eta)$ and we get statement (2).

Now consider the case $e\in L_1-\bigcup_{z\in M_0}L_z$. Then we set $\widehat{S}=\{e'\in S|\ e'\prec_{x_0}e\}$ and $\widehat{e}=\max_{\prec_{x_0}}(\mathcal{A}\cap L((x_0,\widehat{\eta}),\prec_{x_0},S,e))$. Again the fact that e is not $(S,(x_0,\widehat{\eta}))$-special and the properties of the adapted collection $(\prec_z)_{z\in M_0}$ give statement (1). For $z\in M_0$ let $\widehat{S}_z=\widehat{S}-(\widehat{S}\cap L_z)$. The fact that e is not $(S,(z,\widehat{\eta}))$-special tells us that $\widehat{S}_z\cup\{e,\widehat{e}\}$ is linearly dependent modulo L_z. But then also the subset of $\pi^{-1}L_z-L_z$ which defines the same elements in $\mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$ as does $\widehat{S}\cup\{e,\widehat{e}\}$ is linearly dependent modulo L_z, because it contains $\widehat{S}_z\cup\{e,\widehat{e}\}$. Therefore $\delta(e_{\widehat{S}\cup\{e,\widehat{e}\}})$ is a standard generator of $I(z)$. We have shown statement (2).

Finally the case $e\in\bigcup_{z\in M_0}L_z$. Let $z_e\in M_0$ be such that $e\in L_{z_e}$ and L_{z_e} is minimal with this property (this z_e is unique since M_0 is stable). We set $\widehat{S}=\{e'\in S|\ e'\prec_{z_e}e\}$ and $\widehat{e}=\max_{\prec_{z_e}}(\mathcal{A}\cap L((z_e,\widehat{\eta}),\prec_{z_e},S,e))$. The fact that e is not $(S,(z_e,\widehat{\eta}))$-special gives statements (1) and (2) in this case (here $\delta(e_{\widehat{S}\cup\{e,\widehat{e}\}})\in I(x_k)\subset I(\eta)$). Again this is straightforwardly checked using the properties of the adapted collection $(\prec_z)_{z\in M_0}$.

The claim established, statement (2) tells us that we may replace $e_{\widehat{S}\cup\{e\}}$ in $\widetilde{E}/J(\widehat{\eta};M_0)$ by a linear combination of elements $e_{S'}$ with each S' arising from $\widehat{S}\cup\{e,\widehat{e}\}$ by deleting an element of $\widehat{S}\cup\{e\}$. By statement (1) of our claim this means that we may replace e_S by a linear combination of elements $e_{S''}$ with each S'' satisfying $S\prec_z S''$ for all $z\in M_0$ (for the lexicographic ordering $\prec_z$ on the set of subsets of $\mathcal{A}$ of fixed cardinality derived from the ordering $\prec_z$ on $\mathcal{A}$). Repeating the process proves that $G(\widehat{\eta};M_0)$ is generating. That it is finite follows from 2.1. We are done.

We define the complex

$$K(\widehat{\eta},M_0)=\left\{\begin{array}{c}0\longrightarrow\frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z\in M_0}I(\eta\cup\{z\})}\longrightarrow\\ \prod_{z\in M_0}\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z\})\longrightarrow\prod_{\substack{z_1,z_2\in M_0\\ \{z_1,z_2\}\in X^1}}\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z_1,z_2\})\longrightarrow\dots\end{array}\right\}.$$

Proposition 2.5. *For non-empty M_0 as above the following statements hold:*
(**a**) *The complex $K(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ is exact.*
(**b**)

$$J(\widehat{\eta};M_0)=\bigcap_{z\in M_0}I(\eta\cup\{z\}).$$

(**c**) *$\widetilde{E}/\bigcap_{z\in M_0}I(\eta\cup\{z\})$ is a free R-module and $G(\widehat{\eta};M_0)$ is a basis.*

PROOF: For $n\geq 1$ let $(\mathbf{a})_\mathbf{n}$, $(\mathbf{b})_\mathbf{n}$ and $(\mathbf{c})_\mathbf{n}$ be the corresponding statements for all M_0 with $1\leq|M_0|\leq n$. We will prove these statements by simultanuous induction on n.

Statements $(\mathbf{a})_\mathbf{1}$ and $(\mathbf{b})_\mathbf{1}$ are clear, and $(\mathbf{c})_\mathbf{1}$ is 2.1. Now we assume $n>1$. First we prove $(\mathbf{a})_\mathbf{n}$. Choose a $y\in M_0$ for which L_y is maximal, i.e. such that there is no $z\in M_0$ with $L_y\subsetneq L_z$. If we set

$$M_1=M_0-\{y\},\qquad M_1'=\{z\in M_1|\quad L_z\subset L_y\}$$

then M_1 and M_1' are stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$ resp. $(y,\widehat{\eta})$. We claim

$$\bigcap_{z'\in M_1'} I(\eta\cup\{y,z'\}) \;\subset\; I(\eta\cup\{y\}) + \bigcap_{z\in M_1} I(z). \tag{4}$$

For $x\in M_0$ and $S\subset\mathcal{A}$ let S^x be the uniquely determined subset of $L_x-\pi L_x$ which determines the same set of lines in K^{d+1} (or: the same subset of $\mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$) as does S (recall that by convention we view S as a subset of L_k-L_0). By induction hypothesis $(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{n-1}}$, applied to the pointed k-cell $(y,\widehat{\eta})$ and $M_1'\subset N_{(y,\widehat{\eta})}$, a typical generator g of the left hand side of (4) satisfies at least one of the following conditions:

(i) $g\in I(\eta\cup\{y\})$

(ii) $g=\delta(e_0\wedge\ldots\wedge e_r)$ for some $S=\{e_0,\ldots,e_r\}\subset\mathcal{A}$ such that $S^{z'}$ is linearly dependent modulo $\pi L_{z'}$ for all $z'\in M_1'$.

To show that g lies in the right hand side of (4) is difficult only if (i) does not hold. In that case we claim $g\in\bigcap_{z\in M_1} I(z)$. So let S be as in (ii) and let $z\in M_1$ be given. Since M_0 is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$ there exists a $z'\in M_1'$ such that $L_y\cap L_z=L_{z'}$. Now $S^{z'}$ is linearly dependent modulo $\pi L_{z'}$. If S^y was linearly dependent modulo πL_y we would have $g\in I(y)$, but then (i) would hold. Hence S^y is linearly independent modulo πL_y, hence so is $S^{z'}\cap S^y$, and hence $\widetilde{S}=S^{z'}-(S^{z'}\cap S^y)$ is linearly dependent modulo πL_z (since $S^{z'}$ is). On the other hand $\widetilde{S}\subset\pi L_y$ and this implies $\widetilde{S}\cap\pi L_z=\emptyset$ (since $\pi L_y\cap\pi L_z=\pi L_{z'}$). Thus $\widetilde{S}$ is a subset of $L_z-\pi L_z$ which is linearly dependent modulo πL_z. In particular, S^z is linearly dependent modulo πL_z (since $\widetilde{S}\subset S^z$), hence $g\in I(z)$.

We have established the claim (4). Next we claim that

$$\widetilde{E}\longrightarrow\prod_{z\in M_0}\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z\})\longrightarrow\prod_{\substack{z_1,z_2\in M_0\\ \{z_1,z_2\}\in X^1}}\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z_1,z_2\}) \tag{5}$$

is exact; this is equivalent with exactness of $K(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ at the first non trivial degree. Let $(s_z)_{z\in M_0}$ be an element of the kernel of the second arrow in (5). By induction hypothesis $(\mathbf{a})_{\mathbf{n-1}}$ for M_1 we may assume, after modifying $(s_z)_{z\in M_0}$ by the image of an element of $\widetilde{E}$, that $s_z=0$ for all $z\in M_1$. Then it follows that

$$s_y\in\mathrm{Ker}[\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{y\})\longrightarrow\prod_{z'\in M_1'}\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z',y\})].$$

This means that s_y can be lifted to an element $\tilde{s}_y$ of the left hand side of (4). By (4) there exist $\tilde{b}\in I(\eta\cup\{y\})$ and $\tilde{c}\in\bigcap_{z\in M_1} I(\eta\cup\{z\})$ with $\tilde{s}_y=\tilde{b}+\tilde{c}$. Thus $\tilde{c}$ is a preimage of $(s_z)_{z\in M_0}$ and the exactness of (5) is proven. If we define the complex

$$K^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0)=\left\{\begin{array}{c} 0\longrightarrow\frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z\in M_1} I(\eta\cup\{z\})}\longrightarrow\\ \frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z'\in M_1'} I(\eta\cup\{y,z'\})}\times\prod_{z\in M_1}\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z\})\longrightarrow\\ \prod_{\substack{z_1,z_2\in M_0\\ \{z_1,z_2\}\in X^1}}\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z_1,z_2\})\longrightarrow\prod_{\substack{z_1,z_2,z_3\in M_0\\ \{z_1,z_2,z_3\}\in X^2}}\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z_1,z_2,z_3\})\longrightarrow\ldots \end{array}\right\}$$

then we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow K((y,\widehat{\eta}),M_1')[-1] \longrightarrow K^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0) \longrightarrow K(\widehat{\eta},M_1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

By induction hypothesis the complexes $K((y,\widehat{\eta}),M_1')$ and $K(\widehat{\eta},M_1)$ are exact; hence the complex $K^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ is exact. The exactness of $K^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ shows the exactness of $K(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ except at the first non-trivial degree, but at the first non-trivial degree we have already seen exactness. Hence $K(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ is exact and $(\mathbf{a})_{\mathbf{n}}$ is proven.

If we define the complex

$$N^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0) = \{0 \longrightarrow \frac{\bigcap_{z\in M_1} I(\eta\cup\{z\})}{\bigcap_{z\in M_0} I(\eta\cup\{z\})} \longrightarrow \frac{\bigcap_{z\in M_1'} I(\eta\cup\{y,z\})}{I(\eta\cup\{y\})} \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow \ldots\}$$

then we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0) \longrightarrow K(\widehat{\eta},M_0) \longrightarrow K^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since we have seen exactness of $K(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ and of $K^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ we get exactness of $N^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$. Now to prove $(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{n}}$ and $(\mathbf{c})_{\mathbf{n}}$ we first suppose $R=\mathbb{Z}$. By exactness of $N^y(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z\in M_0} I(\eta\cup\{z\})}) - \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z\in M_1} I(\eta\cup\{z\})}) \\ &= \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{y\})) - \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z\in M_1'} I(\eta\cup\{y,z\})}). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Observe that the collection $(\prec_z)_{z\in M_1}$, resp. $(\prec_{z'})_{z'\in M_1'}$, resp. $\prec_y$ is adapted to $(M_1,\widehat{\eta})$, resp. to $(M_1',(y,\widehat{\eta}))$, resp. $(\{y\},\widehat{\eta})$. We associate the sets $G(\widehat{\eta};M_1)$, resp. $G((y,\widehat{\eta});M_1')$, resp. $G(\widehat{\eta};\{y\})$ as before and claim

$$G(\widehat{\eta};M_0) = G(\widehat{\eta};M_1)\bigcup G(\widehat{\eta};\{y\}) \tag{7}$$

$$G((y,\widehat{\eta});M_1') = G(\widehat{\eta};M_1)\bigcap G(\widehat{\eta};\{y\}). \tag{8}$$

Here (7) and $\subset$ in (8) are very easy. To prove $\supset$ in (8), let $e_S \in G(\widehat{\eta};M_1)\bigcap G(\widehat{\eta};\{y\})$ and let $e\in S$. Then e is $(S,(y,\widehat{\eta}))$-special and $(S,(z,\widehat{\eta}))$-special for some $z\in M_1$. Let $z'\in M_1'$ be the element with $L_y\cap L_z = L_{z'}$. We will show that e is $(S,(z,y,\widehat{\eta}))$-special. If $e\in L_y$ then

$$e = \max_{\prec_z}(\mathcal{A}\cap L((z,\widehat{\eta}),\prec_z,S,e)) = \max_{\prec_{z'}}(\mathcal{A}\cap L((z',y,\widehat{\eta}),\prec_{z'},S,e))$$

where the first equality follows from the $(S,(z,\widehat{\eta}))$-speciality of e and the second one from $L_y\cap L_z = L_{z'}$. If however $e\notin L_y$ then

$$e = \max_{\prec_y}(\mathcal{A}\cap L((y,\widehat{\eta}),\prec_y,S,e)) = \max_{\prec_{z'}}(\mathcal{A}\cap L((z',y,\widehat{\eta}),\prec_{z'},S,e))$$

where the first equality follows from the $(S,(y,\widehat{\eta}))$-speciality of e and the second one is clear.

From (7) and (8) we deduce

$$|G(\widehat{\eta};M_0)| = |G(\widehat{\eta};M_1)| + |G(\widehat{\eta};\{y\})| - |G((y,\widehat{\eta});M_1')|. \tag{9}$$

By induction hypothesis $(\mathbf{c})_{\mathbf{n-1}}$ we know

$$\begin{aligned} |G(\widehat{\eta};M_1)| &= \mathrm{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z\in M_1} I(\eta\cup\{z\})}) \\ |G(\widehat{\eta};\{y\})| &= \mathrm{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{y\})) \\ |G((y,\widehat{\eta});M_1')| &= \mathrm{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z\in M_1'} I(\eta\cup\{y,z\})}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we may compare (6) with (9) to obtain

$$\mathrm{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z\in M_0} I(\eta\cup\{z\})}) = |G(\widehat{\eta};M_0)|.$$

Comparing with 2.4 we see that source and target of the canonical surjection

$$\frac{\widetilde{E}}{J(\widehat{\eta};M_0)} \longrightarrow \frac{\widetilde{E}}{\bigcap_{z\in M_0} I(\eta\cup\{z\})}$$

have the same finite $\mathbb{Z}$-rank. But the source is free over $\mathbb{Z}$ (because the $\mathbb{Z}$-submodule $J(\widehat{\eta};M_0)$ of $\widetilde{E}$ has a set of generators each of which is a linear combination, *with coefficients in* $\{-1,1\}$, of elements of the obvious (countable) $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\widetilde{E}$). Hence this surjection is bijective, so $(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{n}}$ and $(\mathbf{c})_{\mathbf{n}}$ follow if $R=\mathbb{Z}$, and then for arbitrary R by base change.

Theorem 2.6. *For any $\mathcal{A}\subset\mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$, possibly infinite, the ccs $\widetilde{A}$ and A satisfy $\mathcal{S}(k)$ for any $1\le k\le d$.*

Proof: The condition $\mathcal{S}(k)$ for $\widetilde{A}$ requires that for any pointed $(k-1)$-simplex $\widehat{\eta}$ and any subset $M_0\subset N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ which is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$ the sequence

$$\widetilde{A}(\eta) \longrightarrow \prod_{z\in M_0} \widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z\}) \longrightarrow \prod_{\substack{z_1,z_2\in M_0\\ \{z_1,z_2\}\in X^1}} \widetilde{A}(\eta\cup\{z_1,z_2\})$$

is exact. For fixed $\widehat{\eta}$ we may pass to a suitable finite subset of $\mathcal{A}$ without changing any of the involved groups. Hence we are in the situation considered above and what we need to show is precisely the exactness of $K(\widehat{\eta},M_0)$ at its first non trivial degree. This we did in 2.5. Hence $\widetilde{A}$ satisfies $\mathcal{S}(k)$. But then also A satisfies $\mathcal{S}(k)$ because of the split exact sequence (3).

Corollary 2.7. *The ccs $\widetilde{A}$ and A on X are acyclic in positive degrees: for any $k\ge 1$ we have $H^k(X,A)=0$ and $H^k(X,\widetilde{A})=0$.*

PROOF: 1.2 and 2.6.

For the rest of this section we assume $\mathrm{char}(K) = 0$ and take $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{P}(K^{d+1})$. We write A_R instead of A in order to specify the chosen base ring R. Let $\Omega_K^{(d+1)}$ be Drinfel'd's symmetric space of dimension d over K. This is the K-rigid space obtained by removing all K-rational hyperplanes from projective d-space $\mathbb{P}_K^d$. There is a natural $\mathrm{GL}_{d+1}(K)$-equivariant *reduction map*

$$r : \Omega_K^{(d+1)} \longrightarrow X$$

(see e.g. [3] for the precise meaning of r). For a simplex σ of X let $]\sigma[= r^{-1}(Star(\sigma))$, the preimage in $\Omega_K^{(d+1)}$ of the star of σ: the star of σ is the union of the open simplices whose closure contains σ. This $]\sigma[$ is an admissible open subset of $\Omega_K^{(d+1)}$, and the collection of all the $]\sigma[$ forms an admissible open covering of $\Omega_K^{(d+1)}$.

Proposition 2.8. *(de Shalit) [3] For a simplex σ of X denote by $H_{dR}^k(]\sigma[)$ the k-th de Rham cohomology group of the K-rigid space $]\sigma[$. There is a natural isomorphism*

$$H_{dR}^k(]\sigma[) \cong A_K^k(\sigma).$$

Corollary 2.9. *(1) (Local acyclicity) Let σ be a simplex. For any $k \geq 0$ the sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow H_{dR}^k(\bigcup_{x\in\sigma}]x[) \longrightarrow \prod_{x\in\sigma} H_{dR}^k(]x[) \longrightarrow \prod_{\substack{\tau\in X^1\\ \tau\subset\sigma}} H_{dR}^k(]\tau[) \longrightarrow \dots$$

is exact.
(2) (Global acyclicity) (de Shalit) The sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H_{dR}^k(\Omega_K^{(d+1)}) \longrightarrow \prod_{x\in X^0} H_{dR}^k(]x[) \longrightarrow \prod_{\sigma\in X^1} H_{dR}^k(]\sigma[) \longrightarrow \dots$$

is exact.

PROOF: (1) Choose a vertex $x \in \sigma$. Then $M_0 = \sigma - \{x\}$ is (as a set of vertices) stable with respect to x. Since the ccs A_K satisfies $\mathcal{S}(k)$ for any k, we derive just as in the proof of 2.5 that the sequence

$$\prod_{z\in\sigma} A_K(z) \longrightarrow \prod_{\substack{\tau\in X^1\\ \tau\subset\sigma}} A_K(\tau) \longrightarrow \dots$$

is exact. Inserting 2.8 it becomes the exact sequence

$$\prod_{x\in\sigma} H_{dR}^k(]x[) \longrightarrow \prod_{\substack{\tau\in X^1\\ \tau\subset\sigma}} H_{dR}^k(]\tau[) \longrightarrow \dots.$$

On the other hand we have the the spectral sequence

$$E_1^{rs} = \prod_{\substack{\tau\in X^r\\ \tau\subset\sigma}} H_{dR}^s(]\tau[) \Longrightarrow H_{dR}^{s+r}(\bigcup_{x\in\sigma}]x[).$$

Together (1) follows. The proof of (2) works the same way, using 2.7 instead of 2.6.

Corollary 2.9 gives a precise expression of $H^k_{dR}(\Omega^{(d+1)}_K)$ through all the $H^k_{dR}(]\sigma[)$. The natural $\mathbb{Z}$-structures $A^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(\sigma)$ in the $A^k_K(\sigma)$ provide natural $\mathbb{Z}$-structures $H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(]\sigma[)$ in the $H^k_{dR}(]\sigma[)$; hence the $\mathrm{GL}_{d+1}(K)$-stable subgroup

$$H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Omega^{(d+1)}_K) = \mathrm{Ker}[\prod_{x\in X^0} H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(]x[) \longrightarrow \prod_{\sigma\in X^1} H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(]\sigma[)]$$

of $H^k_{dR}(\Omega^{(d+1)}_K)$. Now our theorem 2.7 expresses $H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Omega^{(d+1)}_K)$ *precisely* through the local terms $A^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(\sigma)$: it tells us that $H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Omega^{(d+1)}_K)$ is quasiisomorphic with the complex

$$\prod_{x\in X^0} H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(]x[) \longrightarrow \prod_{\sigma\in X^1} H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(]\sigma[) \longrightarrow \prod_{\sigma\in X^2} H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(]\sigma[) \longrightarrow \dots . \tag{10}$$

Let us explain why this should have an application to a challenging problem on p-adic Abel-Jacobi mappings raised by Raskind and Xarles [8]. Let $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{PGL}_{d+1}(K)$ be a cocompact discrete subgroup such that the quotient $Y = \Gamma\backslash\Omega^{(d+1)}_K$, a smooth projective K-scheme, has strictly semistable reduction. For $1 \leq k \leq d$, Raskind and Xarles associate to Y a certain rigid analytic torus $J^k(Y)$, a "p-adic intermediate Jacobian" ($J^1(Y)$ is the Picard variety of Y and $J^d(Y)$ is the Albanese variety of Y). The device for the construction of $J^k(Y)$ is a canonical $\mathbb{Z}$-structure in the graded pieces $\mathrm{Gr}^M_* H^k(Y)$ of the monodromy filtration on the cohomology $H^k(Y)$ of Y — both ℓ-adic ($\ell \neq p$) and log crystalline ($\cong$ de Rham) cohomology. This $\mathbb{Z}$-structure results from the fact that for any component intersection Z of the reduction of Y (so each Z is a smooth projective k-scheme), the cycle map

$$CH^k(Z \times_k \overline{k}) \otimes W(-k)/\mathrm{tors} \longrightarrow H^{2k}_{crys}(Z \times_k \overline{k}/W)/\mathrm{tors}$$

is bijective (here $W(-k)$ is the ring of Witt vectors W with the action of Frobenius multiplied by p^k); similarly for ℓ-adic cohomology, as was recently proved by Ito [7]. That is, the $\mathbb{Z}$-structure is essentially given by the collection of Chow groups for all Z. Then they define an Abel-Jacobi mapping

$$CH^k(Y)_{\mathrm{hom}} \longrightarrow J^k(Y)(K)$$

with $CH^k(Y)_{\mathrm{hom}}$ the group of cycles that are homologically equivalent to zero, using the ℓ-adic ($\ell \neq p$ and $\ell = p$) Abel-Jabobi mapping which involves the Galois cohomology groups $H^1_g(K,.)$ defined by Bloch and Kato. As they point out, it would be helpful to define the Abel-Jabobi mapping by analytic means.

We expect that such a definition involves p-adic integration of cycles on the (contractible !) K-rigid space $\Omega^{(d+1)}_K$, similar to Besser's p-adic integration on K-varieties with good reduction. The link would be the covering spectral sequence

$$E_2^{rs} = H^r(\Gamma, H^s(\Omega^{(d+1)}_K)) \Longrightarrow H^{r+s}(Y)$$

(which exists for both ℓ-adic ($\ell \neq p$) and de Rham cohomology). Indeed, we know that the associated filtration on $H^k(Y)$ *is* the monodromy filtration ([4], [5], [7]), therefore the $\mathbb{Z}$-structure

$H^k_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Omega^{(d+1)}_K)$ in $H^k(\Omega^{(d+1)}_K)$ gives a $\mathbb{Z}$-structure in $\mathrm{Gr}^M_* H^k(Y)$. A comparison with that of Raskind and Xarles probably needs the resolution (10): the component intersections Z considered by them correspond precisely to the simplices of the quotient simplicial complex $\Gamma\backslash X$.

3 Local systems arising from representations

Let K, $\mathcal{O}_K$, π, k, X and its orientation be as in section 2. We fix a natural number $n \geq 1$ and let

$$U = U^{(n)} = \{g \in \mathrm{GL}_{d+1}(\mathcal{O}_K) |\ g \equiv 1 \mod \pi^n\}$$

denote the principal congruence subgroup of level n in $G = \mathrm{GL}_{d+1}(K)$. For a vertex $x \in X^0$ we let

$$U_x = U^{(n)}_x = gUg^{-1} \text{ if } x = g([\mathcal{O}_K^{d+1}]) \text{ for some } g \in G$$

and for a simplex $\tau = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ we let

$$U_\tau = \text{ the subgroup generated by } U_{x_1} \cup \ldots \cup U_{x_k}.$$

This is a pro-p-group, $p = \mathrm{char}(k)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose the lattices L_z, L_{x_1} and L_{x_2} represent vertices z, x_1 and x_2 in X^0 such that both x_1 and x_2 are incident to z and such that $L_z = L_{x_1} \cap L_{x_2}$. Then $U_z \subset U_{x_1} U_{x_2}$.*

Proof: Applying a suitable $g \in G$ we may assume that $L_z = \mathcal{O}_K^{d+1}$ and $L_{x_s} = t^s \mathcal{O}_K^{d+1}$ for diagonal matrices $\mathrm{id} \neq t^s = (t^s_0, \ldots, t^s_d)$ satisfying $\{1\} \subset \{t^1_j, t^2_j\} \subset \{1, \pi^{-1}\}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq d$. But then $U_z = U$ as defined above, and $U_{x_s} = t^s U (t^s)^{-1}$ and an easy matrix argument gives the claim.

[11] Proposition I.3.1 significantly strengthens 3.1. It is this interpolation property of the groups U_x which also underlies the acyclicity proof in [10] and the much more general theory in [11].

Let V be a smooth representation of G on a (not necessarily free) $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$-module V which is generated, as a G-representation, by its U-fixed vectors. Because of $U_\sigma \subset U_\tau$ if $\sigma \subset \tau$ we can form the hcs $\underline{V} = (V^{U_\tau})$ of subspaces of fixed vectors

$$V^{U_\tau} = \{v \in V |\ gv = g \text{ for all } g \in U_\tau\}$$

with the obvious inclusions as transition maps. In the special case where our V is a G representation on a $\mathbb{C}$-vector space (not just on a $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$-module), the following theorem (and its version for $n = 1$) was proved in [10].

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose $n > 1$. Then the chain complex $C_\bullet(X, \underline{V})$ is a resolution of V.*

Proof: To see $H_k(X, \underline{V}) = 0$ for $k \geq 1$ it suffices, by 1.7, to prove $\mathcal{S}^*(k)$, i.e. to prove that for any pointed $(k-1)$-simplex $\widehat{\eta}$ with underlying $(k-1)$-simplex η and for any subset M_0 of

$N_{\widehat{\eta}}$ which is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$, the sequence

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{z,z'\in M_0\\ \{z,z'\}\in X^1}} V^{U_{\{z,z'\}\cup\eta}} \xrightarrow{\partial_k} \bigoplus_{z\in M_0} V^{U_{\{z\}\cup\eta}} \xrightarrow{\partial_{k-1}} V^{U_\eta}$$

is exact. We use induction on $|M_0|$. If M_0 is non-empty choose a $y \in M_0$ for which L_y is maximal, i.e. there is no $z \in M_0$ with $L_y \subsetneq L_z$. Then $M_1 = M_0 - \{y\}$ is stable with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$. Letting

$$M_1' = \{z' \in M_1 |\ \{y, z'\} \in X^1\}$$

we first claim that

$$\bigoplus_{z'\in M_1'} V^{U_{\{y,z'\}\cup\eta}} \longrightarrow V^{U_y} \bigcap \sum_{z\in M_1} V^{U_{\{z\}\cup\eta}} \tag{11}$$

is surjective. Let $v = \sum_{z\in M_1} v_z$ be an element of the right hand side with $v_z \in V^{U_{\{z\}\cup\eta}}$ for all $z \in M_1$. Since V is smooth we can find a finitely generated submodule V' of V containing all the v_z which is stable under U_y. The action of U_y on V' factors through a finite quotient of U_y; let $\overline{U}_y \subset U_y$ be a set of representatives for this quotient. Since v is fixed by U_y it follows that

$$v = \frac{1}{|\overline{U}_y|} \sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g.v = \sum_{z\in M_1} \frac{1}{|\overline{U}_y|} \sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g.v_z.$$

Since M_0 is stable, there exists for any $z \in M_1$ a $z' \in M_1'$ such that $L_{z'} = L_z \cap L_y$. It will be enough to show $\sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g.v_z \in V^{U_{\{y,z'\}\cup\eta}}$. The stability under U_y is clear. Now let $h \in U_{z'}$. By 3.1 we may factor h as $h = h_y h_z$ with $h_y \in U_y$ and $h_z \in U_z$. Since $n > 1$ and since there is a vertex incident to both z and y we have $g^{-1}U_z g = U_z$ for any $g \in U_y$, hence $h_z g = g h_z^g$ with $h_z^g \in U_z$. Thus

$$h \sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g.v_z = h_y \sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g h_z^g.v_z = \sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g.v_z,$$

i.e. $\sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g.v_z$ is stable under $U_{z'}$. Finally let $h \in U_x$ for some $x \in \eta$. Since x and y are incident we have $g^{-1}U_x g = U_x$, hence there is for any $g \in U_y$ a $h^g \in U_x$ with $hg = gh^g$. Then

$$h \sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g.v_z = \sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g h^g.v_z = \sum_{g\in\overline{U}_y} g.v_z$$

so we have shown stability under U_η. The surjectivity of (11) is proven. Now let $c = (c_z)_{z\in M_0}$ be an element of $\mathrm{Ker}(\partial_{k-1})$. Then necessarily

$$c_y \in V^{U_y} \bigcap \sum_{z\in M_1} V^{U_{\{z\}\cup\eta}}.$$

By the surjectivity of (11) we may therefore modify c by an element of $\mathrm{im}(\partial_k)$ such that for the new $c = (c_z)_{z\in M_0} \in \mathrm{Ker}(\partial_{k-1})$ we have $c_y = 0$. But then the induction hypothesis, applied to M_1, tells us that after another such modification we can achieve $c = 0$. We have shown that $C_\bullet(X, \underline{V})$ is exact in positive degrees. It remains to observe that the hypothesis that V is generated by V^U is equivalent with the surjectivity of

$$C_0(X, \underline{V}) = \bigoplus_{x\in X^0} V^{U_x} \longrightarrow V.$$

References

[1] *G. Alon*, Cohomology of local systems coming from p-adic hyperplane arrangements, to appear in Israel J. Math.

[2] *K. S. Brown*, Buildings, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer (1989)

[3] *E. de Shalit*, Residues on buildings and de Rham cohomology of p-adic symmetric domains, Duke Math. J. **106** (2001), no.1, 123–191

[4] *E. de Shalit*, The p-adic monodromy-weight conjecture for p-adically uniformized varieties, Compositio Math. **141** (2005), no. 1, 101–120

[5] *E. Grosse-Klönne*, Frobenius and Monodromy operators in rigid analysis, and Drinfel'd's symmetric space, Journal of Algebraic Geometry 14 (2005), 391–437

[6] *E. Grosse-Klönne*, Integral structures in the p-adic holomorphic discrete series, Representation Theory 9 (2005), 354–384

[7] *T. Ito*, Weight-Monodromy conjecture for p-adically uniformized varieties, preprint 2003

[8] *W. Raskind and X. Xarles*, On the étale cohomology of algebraic varieties with totally degenerate reduction over p-adic fields, preprint 2003

[9] *P. Schneider*, The cohomology of local systems on p-adically uniformized varieties, Math. Ann. **293**, 623–650 (1992)

[10] *P. Schneider and U. Stuhler*, Resolutions for smooth representations of the general linear group over a local field, J. reine angew. Math. **436**, 19–32 (1993)

[11] *P. Schneider and U. Stuhler*, Representation theory and sheaves on the Bruhat-Tits building, Publ. Math. IHES **85**, 97 – 191 (1997)